

MINUTES

MONTANA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES 57th LEGISLATURE - REGULAR SESSION COMMITTEE ON RULES

Call to Order: By **CHAIRMAN PAUL SLITER**, on December 8, 2000 at 8:00 A.M., in Room 317A Capitol.

ROLL CALL

Members Present:

Rep. Paul Sliter, Chairman (R)
Rep. Doug Mood, Vice Chairman Majority(R)
Rep. Kim Gillan, Vice Chairman Minority (D)
Rep. Roy Brown (R)
Rep. Tom Facey (D)
Rep. Dan Fuchs (R)
Rep. George Golie (D)
Rep. Monica Lindeen (D)
Rep. Dan McGee (R)
Rep. Jim Shockley (R)
Rep. Joe Tropila (D)
Rep. Steve Vick (R)
Rep. Cindy Younkin (R)

Members Excused: Rep. John Witt (R)

Members Absent: None.

Staff Present: Fredella D. Haab, Committee Secretary
Greg Petesch, Legislative Branch

Please Note: These are summary minutes. Testimony and discussion are paraphrased and condensed.

Committee Business Summary:

Hearing(s) & Date(s) Posted:
Executive Action:

CHAIRMAN PAUL SLITER asked **REP. DOUG MOOD** for his amendments.

REP. MOOD said he had two amendments to the Rules. The first one had to do with the segregation of the question on House Bill 2. The amendment was proposed that an amendment to the Generals Appropriations Act may not be segregated. We had that happen in the last two sessions that there had been a motion to segregate

the amendment when there was a reduction in spending in the one area of House Bill 2 and an increase, a corresponding increase in another. What was being suggested was segregation was probably inappropriate in that an individual who proposed an amendment to House Bill 2 had the right to have the amendment voted on. In fact, the segregation was on two different acts but in fact the amendment was an integral amendment and if the people wanted to reduce the budget they should introduce amendments that reduce the budget specifically. That was what this language would do.

CHAIRMAN SLITER asked him to move his amendment.

Motion: **REP. MOOD** moved **THE SEGREGATION OF THE QUESTION ON HOUSE BILL 2.**

CHAIRMAN SLITER asked for discussion of the amendment.

REP. GOLIE said about two years ago when **Peggy Bergsagel** had her travel amendment. There was about a dozen categories with reductions in each agency. Some of them, for instance, the School for the Deaf and Blind in Great Falls, would have been a really big hit on them so he thought they did segregate that one and in that instance he thought this would be a bad amendment in that case.

REP. LINDEEN was wondering if you could accomplish the same thing just by adding a couple of more words to the back of the amendment and having it read, "It was not divisible unless the sponsor agreed." That way there was some room for flexibility allowing, depending on the amendment, for some divisions.

CHAIRMAN SLITER interjected that this was something that he wrote down at the end of last session because what happened. Somebody threw an amendment up on the board and somebody else will stand up and said divide it. That way we can all go for the cut and nobody can vote for the put back and we have a net reduction in the budget which was fun to do. Every time he could remember it being done it was challenged to the Rules Committee. Assuming that the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole at the time had determined that the question was divisible or not divisible, somebody would challenge it. We end up going to the Rules Committee. He could remember **REP. COBB'S** debates that we had over the rules and the Rules Committee and whether or not questions were divisible. That was why he asked **REP. MOOD** to sponsor the amendment. It was for the sake of efficiency on the floor during second reading. If they don't think it was necessary, we can drop it completely and just deal with it as it comes along.

REP. MONICA LINDEEN had written down a note also about this section because of what occurred on the floor and she thought that there needed to be some clarification. She thought we can accomplish it by allowing it to be the sponsor's decision. The sponsor made the decision so that we do have some flexibility. She did agree that it can be a problem so if we were to go ahead and amend the amendment to say the proposal amended to the General Appropriations Act may not be divided unless the sponsor agreed to it.

Substitute Motion: **REP. MONICA LINDEEN** made a substitute motion **WITH THE CONSENT OF THE AMENDMENT'S SPONSOR.**

CHAIRMAN SLITER asked if it would read "with the consent of the amendment's sponsor." **REP. LINDEEN** agreed.

CHAIRMAN SLITER asked for any discussion on the substitute amendment.

SPEAKER DAN MCGEE said it seemed to him that the decision to segregate or to divide was one that the body made and not an individual. If we adopt **REP. LINDEEN'S** language it really falls to one individual to decide whether the question was divisible and he thought perhaps it would be better if we, as the Rules Committee, simply make the decision. It was either divisible or it was not divisible. He didn't know if it should be left up to the single sponsor.

CHAIRMAN SLITER inquired of **Mr. Pettish** about that. It was his understanding that if it was requested by an individual member that a question be segregated, it was segregated immediately if the chairman of the Committee of the Whole was to determine that it was divisible. Was that the case?

Mr. Petesch agreed. If they looked at H 51-30 which was amended to reflect a reference, it was stated as a right of a Representative to request a division and if the chair moves that it was an appropriate division the question was divided at that point. Someone would have to challenge the ruling of the chair in order to get it before the Rules Committee.

REP. ROY BROWN asked if they did it the way **REP. LINDEEN** had purposed, would it affect all divisions in question? He thought what they were trying to do was just amend the situation in House Bill 2.

CHAIRMAN SLITER said the amendment reads and the substitute amendment would read, "A proposed amendment to the General Appropriations Act may not be divided without the consent of the

amendment's sponsor." So this was completely limited to House Bill 2.

REP. STEVE VICK said it seemed to him that this could be dealt with another way. Leave **REP. MOOD'S** amendment the way it was and then you change your own amendment to a bill. You can withdraw the amendment and propose a separate one. If somebody asked for a division you can withdraw the amendment and make two separate amendments. The problem he saw with segregating amendments was especially in the Appropriations Bill was there was another problem besides the delays and the confusion as to actually wonder what you're holding. You run all these numbers across that board and people don't know if their voting for the cut or the increase and there was just so many numbers coming and he thought that strategically and from a practical standpoint leaving it this way was better and then it was clear cut and you see the amendment, talk to the sponsor about them making two amendments or taking the School for the Deaf and Blind out.

CHAIRMAN SLITER said he wouldn't anticipate that an amendment sponsor would be agreeable to withdrawing their amendment and offering two separate amendments because they would know full well what you were up to. If he had an amendment that said takes money out of here and put it in here and you said to me, why don't we turn this into two different amendments and see how it goes, he would say, "Let's not."

REP. MOOD said it seemed to him the sponsor had the opportunity to separate the amendment when they introduced it.

REP. JOE TROPILA had a problem with this. The problem he had with it was that there was a global motion to make a 10% cut in the whole bill and if we can't divide it, then he had a problem.

CHAIRMAN SLITER said a motion "for an across the board cut" needs to have two questions in it before it could be divided. If there was a separate motion to make a sweeping cut across the board it would seem to me that would come in the form of several different motions on each particular section.

REP. TROPILA said it would harm the institutions and the School for the Deaf and Blind because those kids need transportation to get wherever they were going. It affected Warm Springs and Boulder and that was across the board transportation cut period. All the entities that needed the transportation law would be affected.

CHAIRMAN SLITER said they could surely let the amendment go by the way side and leave things the way they are. Time was the

consideration that he had and he suspected that the minority would be in favor of the amendment based on some of the fights that they had on the floor in the past about dividing an amendment. It caused some consternation at times and you know while it was a time saving factor he thought it was a fairness issue as well. He would definitely defer to the committee as to what you want to do with it.

REP. MOOD said he would withdraw the amendment if the minority didn't like it.

CHAIRMAN SLITER asked **REP. LINDEEN** if she would like to withdraw her motion.

REP. LINDEEN said if everybody withdrew the entire amendment then she would withdraw hers.

REP. MOOD withdrew his amendment.

REP. MOOD had a second amendment which he thought was under changing a vote. He talked to former **Rep. Joe Quilici** during this last session and he said he had never seen as many vote changes on the floor as we had in the last session. The second rule changes under 50-200 change of vote and all it simply does was say that if you're going to change the vote, you have to do it under the Order of Business # 9. It had to be done within one day. He would suggest that limiting the change of the vote to the rule Order of Business #9 would facilitate the order of business and make it a little more orderly on the floor as well.

Motion: **REP. MOOD** moved **IN ORDER TO CHANGE VOTE MUST BE ON ORDER OF BUSINESS #9.**

CHAIRMAN SLITER asked for discussion.

Vote: Motion **carried unanimously.**

Mr. Petesch said the other change in the rule on changing your vote was in my editorial change, because he thought the rule as written said all of the members present and voting shall consent to the change, did not allow you to not consent. He just clarified that. Unanimous consent was required to change a vote which was what the original language was intended to do.

CHAIRMAN SLITER said if there was a motion to change a vote, and the vote was not unanimous then the vote cannot be changed. If the vote was unanimous, then the vote was changed. The last amendment we had was at the top of the amendments and that deals with the name of the committees.

REP. MOOD said the new committee would be specifically on Energy issues. Energy and Telecommunications but we've expanded the scope of that committee so that the name should be changed to the Federal Energy and Telecommunications under State Federal Regulations.

CHAIRMAN SLITER said the name we had, and if this was just for clarity purposes or, it was my understanding that the name we had adopted was Energy, Telecommunications, and Federal Issues. He was under the understanding that it started with Energy, Telecommunications and Federal Issues.

SPEAKER MCGEE asked **Chief Clerk of the House, Marilyn Miller**, how much trouble are we going to get into changing that name right now with stationary.

Chief Clerk Miller said if we change it right now, not a lot. But, any later and it would be a problem.

CHAIRMAN SLITER asked the pleasure to the committee.

Motion: MCGEE moved **TO CHANGE THE NAME TO FEDERAL RELATIONS, ENERGY AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS.**

Vote: Motion **carried unanimously.**

Chief Clerk Miller said she would check on the status of stationary.

CHAIRMAN SLITER did not think the addition of the word "Relations" and it was showing up that way on peoples stationary, if it's already gone to the printer, he didn't that this was a significant problem. The name of the Committee has not been substantially changed by the rule change.

Motion: REP. MOOD moved **TO ACCEPT THE MASON'S CHANGES FROM 1989 EDITION TO THE 2000 EDITION.**

Vote: Motion **carried unanimously.**

SPEAKER MCGEE asked **Mr. Petesch** if those books were available through Legislative Services or how can we get a copy of them?

Mr. Petesch said they were on order from NCSL. They have agreed to expedite them. There were eight copies. We can get them individually then through NCSL. Each book was \$40.00 plus shipping for \$46.00. He had just got this yesterday so that was why he made the quick change to the rule. He knew that there are

like twenty copies that have been ordered through Legislative Services with eight for the Senate, eight for the House and four for the Services Division. The NCSL has put together a preface that describes the changes and they are not significant.

Motion: REP. GILLAN moved TO AMEND 10-20 UNDER SPEAKER'S DUTIES H10-20, TO TAKE UNDER CONSIDERATION THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE MINORITY LEADERS FOR COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS.

MINORITY LEADER KIM GILLAN said her amendment institutionalized what we already did this time. And the reason to institutionalize it was because of term limits and changing it, it seemed that there was some value to putting it in there that the part of making these committee assignments the speaker shall receive and take into consideration the recommendations of the Minority Leader assignments in the appointment of minority leaders. She thought that this was something that would do us well as we move to the future as we lose some of the institutional history that came with it specifically. She knew in her case that just trying to find out the most expeditious way to provide me with the information on the committees assignments and her meant to put into writing, or put into the rules something that we do already.

CHAIRMAN SLITER asked if there was any discussion on the motion.

SPEAKER MCGEE said the only thing that he could see was if time becomes an important factor in making committee assignments if it said, parts of the assignments the Speaker shall receive are taken into consideration. If for some reason the Minority Leader chose to stonewall for example when the ability to get committees in place was in jeopardy.

Substitute Motion: REP. FACEY made a substitute motion TO TAKE OUT THE WORDS "RECEIVE AND" SO IT WOULD READ, "THE SPEAKER SHALL TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION."

CHAIRMAN SLITER said we are on the motion of Rep Facey to move the amendment as presented by **REP. GILLAN**.

MINORITY LEADER GILLAN she didn't really care for that. She thought that there was a formality that we did this time. She thought that it required the minority party to sort of put every thing together in a packet and she actually like the word receive in there. We could somehow change the word, prior or say in the process of making committee assignments and then not put prior that might make it feel more comfortable.

SPEAKER MCGEE said it seemed to him "in a timely manner" does put it back into the discretion of the speaker. Let's face it we're all new at this and we have this really abbreviated time frame and we acted very quickly to get committees out. He could tell you we worked long hours trying to get all this stuff done. He thought "in a timely fashion" still leaves it to the desecration of the speaker.

REP. FACEY withdrew his substitute motion.

CHAIRMAN SLITER said they were back on the main amendment if you'd like to make a substitute motion for your amendments you can do that, or withdraw it.

REP. MOOD said he didn't like how the amendment puts the onus on the speaker to receive it rather than on the minority leader to deliver. He understood this was under a section called Speakers duties but he thought it was the Minority Leader's responsibility to deliver the assignments that they would prefer to the speaker rather than the Speaker's responsibility to receive them.

Mr. Petesch said you could provide prior to making the assignments the Speaker shall take into consideration any timely recommendations from the minority leader. That takes out the "receive" and does have the "timely" added.

SPEAKER MCGEE said he thought he had to go back to what **REP. FACEY** was saying. Whether he received it by telephone call or received it on a piece of paper, was not the issue. The issue was that the minority should be able to give in some fashion to the Speaker their recommendations. He would move the same thing **REP. FACEY** did and strike "receive and." He thought it did what they were trying to do. What we could do was say the Speaker shall receive in written form on four pieces of note paper for consideration, etc.

Substitute Motion: **SPEAKER MCGEE** made a substitute motion **TO TAKE OUT THE WORDS "RECEIVE AND" SO IT WOULD READ, "THE SPEAKER SHALL TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION."**

Mr. Petesch said it was like **REP. FACEY'S** substitute motion.

CHAIRMAN SLITER said the amendment would read, prior to making committee assignments, the Speaker shall take into consideration the recommendations of the Minority Leader for committee assignments.

Vote: Motion **carried**. **CHAIRMAN SLITER** voting **no**.

REP. CINDY YOUNKIN wanted to see the word "minority" inserted before the second committee. So it says, "recommendations of the minority leader for minority committee assignments." She didn't know if the Speaker had to take into consideration the minority leader's recommendations for majority committee assignments.

CHAIRMAN SLITER asked if **Mr. Petesch** if he could do that on a clerical base.

REP. FACEY said he would sincerely like to thank the Speaker and the Chairman for the consideration that we got this time. It helped in the working relationship.

CHAIRMAN SLITER asked if there were any further amendments?

Mr. Petesch had a question for the committee and he was assuming for purposes of drafting this resolution you wanted to maintain gender specific terms in the House Rules. The rules are the one bill that we have been specifically instructed not to draft gender neutral language in them. Referring to the references to chairman etc.

REP. YOUNKIN said as a chairman of a committee she takes offense at being called a chairperson. She was a human and didn't want to be called a huperson. She would prefer chairman.

REP. LINDEEN asked out of curiosity why they have limited that.

Mr. Petesch said he didn't know the answer to that question.

CHAIRMAN SLITER said maybe he could help answer that. It was a grammatical and maybe our resident English scholar can help us out. As a matter of grammar when it comes to committees there was no such thing really as a chair, chairwoman or chairperson, only chairman.

REP. MOOD said if you look in the dictionary chairman it was not a gender specific. It was a description of a position. It has nothing to do with gender and anybody can hold that position whether it was a male or female. The sensitivity that some people in our society seem to have with the word chairman was a little absurd given the history of the word. It does not describe anything to do with gender. This came up in the last Rules meeting because some people were offended to be called chairman when they are Chairman of the Day. They wanted to be called madam chair, which was fine. It doesn't bother me at all but the description in the Rules was a description of a position and that was the chairman.

CHAIRMAN SLITER said if it was a big deal, we would probably not have an objection to changing it. It was a position not a description of an individual.

REP. GOLIE asked if in that case how are we going to address the chairmen in committees?

CHAIRMAN SLITER said he thought it would be up to the individual chairman. **REP. YOUNKIN** prefers to be called the Chairman of the Natural Resource Committee and he thought that was what the members of the committee and staff would call her.

SPEAKER MCGEE said it seemed to him reading through the rules the issue was addressed by calling someone "Madam Chair" or "Mr. Chairman." Really we are just talking about a few letters here and it was like **REP. MOOD** suggested. He thought the proper way to address the chairman was by "Madam" or "Mr." That very clearly established the gender of the individual. The chairman simply established the position that person had as the leader of that committee.

REP. MOOD described how the Chinese character for woman was a combination of the character for man and the character for servant. The woman was described as a servant for the man.

REP. FACEY asked if the chairman had any proposed rules on any electronic devices used on the floor during session.

CHAIRMAN SLITER said that was a ruling by the Speaker and would not be taken by the Rules Committee.

REP. VICK wanted to go back to the previous amendment on the appropriation division that **REP. MOOD** had. He thought the opposition largely was based on global motions and across the board cuts that people would like to take something out of there. If we go back to **REP. BERGSAGEL'S** motion, it was passed in the House and then it was taken off in the Senate. It never had any effect. He thought that the amendment had a chance of saving some real time and some real confusion on the floor of the House. If there were some way to save it, he would like to do that and maybe to put **REP. LINDEEN'S** suggestion in there. When you have two things, one was an increase and the other was a cut, it was much better if you just vote on them together because then your vote would delay them as the amendment was intended. They aren't going to let you separate, the sponsor, probably but maybe something like this if we go back to the School of the Deaf and Blind out. If there was some way to keep that alive, he would at least discuss it.

CHAIRMAN SLITER asked if he had a motion or what.

Motion: **REP. VICK** moved **REP. MOOD'S AMENDMENT**.

CHAIRMAN SLITER as it stands the amendment simply would read, "a proposed amendment to the General Appropriation's Act may not be divided." Was that the way he wanted it?

REP. VICK said yes until they had some discussion.

REP. FACEY asked if he wanted to increase funding for this agency and my aim was to decrease funding for this agency over here and then separate it and we vote on the decrease first and it passes and then we vote on the increase and that fails. He would be pretty angry.

CHAIRMAN SLITER said that was precisely the consternation that he talked about in the previous discussion. Then you would challenge the decision to the Rules Committee which will cause us to spend a half an hour in the back room trying to decide what to do and it causes people to be angry with each other.

REP. TROPILA was asked to explain his concern about with regard to the **BERGSAGEL'S** amendment from the last session.

REP. TROPILA said first a point of information before he goes to that. That was not the Great Falls School for the Deaf and Blind. It was the Montana School for the Deaf and Blind. It was a state institution and happens to be located in Great Falls. It was a well known and respected throughout the United States of America. Our air force people all over the world, if they had a child in that position, requests duty here because of that school. The **BERGSAGEL** amendment when they did that would have hurt the transportation for all Montana institutions where people had to be transported.

CHAIRMAN SLITER said it was an amendment for across the board percentage cut in transportation.

REP. TROPILA said their feelings were at the time that it would harm all institutions in the State of Montana not only the Montana School for the Deaf and Blind. It couldn't be divided and if it had passed they would have suffered tremendously in their budget. Those children had to be transported. They can't walk anywhere or ride bikes.

CHAIRMAN SLITER asked if their particular transportation question with regard with the institutions was just one of different problems a member can stand up and object to based on the fact

that this particular pet agency or program might be reduced by that. If you had a hundred different people standing up and objecting to the global amendment based on what it would do to their favorite agency or program, the answer was for the individual to vote no. To voice their opposition to it and for the reasons that they opposed it and then vote against it and convince as many of the body as they can to vote against it. A global cut amendment was that and if it was to be proposed as incremental cuts throughout the budget, then those should be proposed individually in either one amendment with specific programs targeted or not. If it goes completely across the board he would think that the body would by and large reject that based on the fact that each individual representative might have their own idea as to what was important and what needed to be maintained in the budget

REP. GOLIE said in regards to the Montana School for the Deaf and Blind he could distinctly recall on that amendment that it had to do with the travel. The Montana School for the Deaf and the Blind did not overspend their budget like the rest of them. What we were going to do then, was to penalize them when we couldn't take them out. So that was why he thought they should just let it stand the way it was.

REP. FACEY was wondering on the example he gave that he would be angry if the cut passed and the addition did not pass. We need to put something in the Rules which comes first.

CHAIRMAN SLITER said as an individual who doesn't like to vote to additions to the budget, he would be offended if somebody voted for the put back but didn't vote for the cut.

REP. VICK was afraid they were going to kill this rule because of one amendment that was made in one session, passed in the House and killed in the Senate. Basically the first day Finance and Claims had House Bill 2, they took that amendment off House Bill 2. That was the only problem we had with this amendment was that one amendment, and maybe for that one amendment it was worth it, but that was something that did not pass. We had the ability to segregate it and he didn't remember anybody trying to segregate anything out of that. Because usually when the question was divided where there was a cut and an increase. Now when it was all cut or all increase he asked **Mr. Petesch** if they could segregate if it were a 3% across the board cut.

Mr. Petesch said he didn't think the motion as made would be divisible because it was a single think. In order to divide a question under current rule, you do it if there are two or more propositions so distinct that they can be separated. Obviously

with a cut in one place and an increase in another that was true. He would say an across the board cut , " I move to cut 10% from agencies' budgets across the board." He thought that it was a single issue. He didn't think there was anything to be segregated from that motion.

CHAIRMAN SLITER thought it would depend largely on who was the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole at the time obviously subject to challenge.

CHAIRMAN SLITER asked for discussion and a roll call vote.

| | |
|-----------------|--------------------|
| Rep.Sliter, yes | Rep. Lindeen, no |
| Mood, yes | Rep. McGee, yes |
| Gillan, no | Rep. Shockley, yes |
| Rep. Brown, yes | Rep.Tropila, no |
| Rep. Facey, no | Rep.Vick, yes |
| Rep. Fuch, yes | Rep. Younkin, yes |
| Rep. Golie, no | |

Vote: Motion **carried 8-5 REPS. GILLAN, FACEY, GOLIE, LINDEEN, AND TROPILA VOTING NO.**

SPEAKER MCGEE had a thought there were really two ways to handle this situation. One was to have a rule in place that said they can segregate and everybody do what we did before. Or, if the same situation happened with **REP. BERGSAGEL'S** amendment what can be was another amendment can be put back in. It was not like it killed one's opportunity to amend back in something that has gotten cut or make that attempt.

CHAIRMAN SLITER said a motion to suspend the rule was also in order.

REP. FACEY said he really thought that if they could remember that amendment there was about 12 in that amendment. Now what was to say that somebody was not going to offer 12 amendments.

SPEAKER MCGEE said that was exactly correct and that was exactly our option. Either way no matter whether we have it divisible or whether we have twenty amendments to put back in the things that just got cut out. That was our charge and our duty. It was to debate those things and that we are not going outside the 50 yard line. Last time it was the 45 yard line.

Mr. Petesch asked if they would like to request a bill to draft the House Rules.

REP. MOOD requested to have a bill drafted to amend the House Rules.

SPEAKER MCGEE had a question of **Mr. Petesch**. He wondered why in committees they do not ask people to swear to their testimony.

REP. LINDEEN said it was not a fact finding hearing and it wasn't before a court of law.

SPEAKER MCGEE asked what established it as fact finding. How in the world can we sit here and say people presenting information to a committee are not presenting facts before that committee for their consideration. Are you talking about a legal sense?

REP. SHOCKLEY said that what you really had before a committee was issues of facts and opinions. Generally speaking you don't swear to an opinion and he didn't think they wanted to intimidate anybody from testifying for a committee and thought it would have bad effects. Secondly, what was your remedy if they are lying?

Mr. Petesch said the other distinction was that even though we refer to testimony taken in committee what we are really doing was fulfilling the constitution mandate to allow citizens to have the opportunity to participate in decision making. What really the citizens are doing was expressing their views on a particular piece of legislation.

REP. LINDEEN said they were a policy making body. Policy was based on opinions as **REP. SHOCKLEY** said not necessarily on pure facts or pure law. We make policy decisions and she agreed if we were to require sworn testimony it would have severe chilling on the number of people willing to testify before the committee.

REP. MOOD asked if the minority would talk to their caucus about the vote change and he would talk to his caucus.

SPEAKER MCGEE said apparently there were some vote changes that took place apart from motions so that was what this whole rule was about.

Chief Clerk of the House Miller said that all the times she has been here legislators had asked her people on the rostrum, her journal clerk, to change their vote. A Legislator came up and said he wanted to vote yes instead of no and it was very difficult for them to say they will not. They had always let them do it and it would be very helpful to us if you would tell your caucuses not to do that.

CHAIRMAN SLITER said it was a clear violation of the rules now and whispering changes would not be accepted by the staff anymore.

Motion: REP. SHOCKLEY moved **TO ADJOURN.**

ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment: 9:00 A.M.

REP. PAUL SLITER, Chairman

FREDELLA D. HAAB, Secretary

PS/FH

EXHIBIT (rus00cad)